

III. REMARKS

Support for Claim Amendments

The amendments to claim 53 are fully supported by the specification and drawings as originally filed, as shown in the following table. It is to be understood that this table is not exhaustive and the features of the claims may also be supported by other portions of the specification and drawings not cited below.

Amendments to Claim 53	Support in Specification/Drawings
A system for <u>locating a vehicle in a multi-level parking facility, the system</u> comprising	Par. [0009], lines 1-2; Fig. 8.
a base <u>inside the vehicle and</u> associated with the card, <u>the base comprising:</u>	Par. [0024], lines 1-2.
<u>a card reader for reading the card;</u>	Par. [0031], lines 1-9; Fig. 1.
a motion sensor, wherein <u>removing the card from the base</u> activates the motion sensor, <u>and wherein inserting the card into the base deactivates the motion sensor;</u> and	Par. [0031], lines 1-3 and 13-14; Par. [0040], lines 5-6 and 15-16; Fig. 1.
<u>a light;</u>	Par. [0038], lines 13-15.
<u>a booth at the entrance of the multi-level parking facility for distributing the card and the base to a driver of the vehicle;</u>	Par. [0037], lines 1-8; Fig. 7.

Amendments to Claim 53	Support in Specification/Drawings
<u>at least three locators on each level of the multi-level parking facility, wherein said at least three locators are in communication with the base;</u>	Par. [0036], lines 1-12; Fig. 6.
a locator panel in communication <u>with the base and with said at least three locators, wherein responsive to the card being inserted into the locator panel, the locator panel [[to]]</u> triangulates the position of the base;	Par. [0036], lines 1-12; Par. [0038], lines 8-10; Par. [0041], lines 8-14.
<u>wherein the base transmits a disturbance signal to the locator panel upon movement of the vehicle while the motion sensor is activated;</u>	Par. [0040], lines 9-14; Fig. 9.
<u>wherein responsive to the locator panel receiving the disturbance signal, the locator panel notifies a security patrol; and</u>	Par. [0040], lines 14-15; Par. [0041], lines 8-13; Fig. 9.
<u>wherein responsive to the driver inserting the card into the locator panel, the locator panel displays the position of the vehicle</u>	Par. [0038], lines 8-19; Par. [0042], lines 1-9; Fig. 10.
<u>and the light in the base illuminates to assist the driver in locating the vehicle.</u>	Par. [0038], lines 13-15.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 53 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention because there was insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the card user.” Claim 53 is amended to eliminate this limitation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

Claim 53 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tompkins (US 5,432,495) in view of Ayed (US 6,405,125). In light of the amendments to claim 53 and the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

1. The Examiner states that Tompkins teaches “a card” (Tompkins 2:19-21; Figs. 1 and 2, item **16**) and “a base” (Tompkins 2:22-24; Figs. 1 and 2, items **18**, **24**, and **26**) as required by the claim. Office Action p. 2.

Applicants note that item **16** of Tompkins is a handheld radio transmitter (Tompkins 2:19-21) and not a “card” as that term is defined in the specification (“[t]he card is used in conjunction with a locator panel to locate a specific base”). Par. [0026], lines 2-3. The unit **16** of Tompkins is not used with “a locator panel” in order to locate the base, which the Examiner identified as items **18**, **24**, and **26**. Rather, the unit **16** is manually activated and simply causes the beeper **12** to start beeping. Tompkins 2:16-21. It is not used “to locate a specific base” and it is used alone, not “with a locator panel.” Thus, the unit **16** fails to meet the claim’s requirement of “a card.”

Additionally, the Examiner has cited three separate objects (items **18**, **24**, and **26**) as being “a base.” However, Applicants have amended claim 53 to require “wherein removing the card from the base activates the motion sensor, and wherein inserting the card into the base deactivates the motion sensor.” The three separate items **18**, **24**, and **26**, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to satisfy this feature of the claim. The motion sensor **24** of

Tompkins is activated by sound emitted by the beeper **12**, which is activated by either a phone call or by radio transmission from unit **16**. Tompkins 2:20-30. The motion sensor **24** is not activated by “removing” the unit **16** from items **18**, **24**, and **26**, and it is not deactivated by “inserting” the unit **16** into items **18**, **24**, and **26**. Finally, the claim is now amended to require that the base comprises “a light.” Such a light is not found in any of items **18**, **24**, or **36**. Thus, items **18**, **24**, and **26** fail to meet the claim’s requirements of “a base.”

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that unit **16** and items **18**, **24**, and **26** fail to meet the claim’s requirements of “a card” and “a base” respectively.

2. Claim 53 now recites “a booth at the entrance of the multi-level parking facility for distributing the card and the base to a driver of the vehicle.” Applicants respectfully assert that neither Tompkins nor Ayed teaches such a booth. Tompkins is not concerned with a parking facility at all, but rather with a vehicle security system. Ayed does not disclose anything about distributing the vehicle locator device upon entry into a parking facility, but rather appears to contemplate that the user already possesses the device before entering the facility (note Ayed’s discussion of integrating the device into a cellular phone or PDA). Ayed 3:64-4:2.

3. Claim 53 now recites “at least three locators on each level of the multi-level parking facility, wherein said at least three locators are in communication with the base” and “a locator panel in communication with ... said at least three locators.” The Examiner states that Ayed 4:12-20 teaches “locators.” Office Action p. 3. However, Ayed does not teach placing “at least three locators on each level of the multi-level parking facility.” Moreover, the beacons **31** of Ayed do not communicate with both “the base” and “a locator panel” as required by the claim. Rather, the beacons **31** only communicate with Ayed’s locator **12**. Ayed 4:27-36. Thus, Ayed does not teach “locators” that meet all of the requirements of amended claim 53.

4. Claim 53 now recites “a locator panel in communication with the base and with said at least three locators, wherein responsive to the card being inserted into the locator panel, the locator panel triangulates to triangulate the position of the base.” The Examiner states that the locator **12** of Ayed is “a locator panel.” Office Action p. 3. However, Ayed’s locator **12** does not have the ability to have a card inserted into it. Therefore Ayed’s locator **12** cannot meet the requirement of amended claim 53 of “responsive to the card being inserted into the locator panel, the locator panel triangulates to triangulate the position of the base.”

5. Claim 53 is now amended to recite “wherein the base transmits a disturbance signal to the locator panel upon movement of the vehicle while the motion sensor is activated.” The Examiner states that Tompkins’ items **18**, **24**, and **26** are the claimed “base” and that Ayed’s locator **12** is the claimed “locator panel.” Office Action pp. 2-3. However, the claim is amended to require that the base communicates with the locator panel when the vehicle is moved. As the Examiner states at page 3 of the Office Action, “Tompkins ... does not disclose a locator panel.” Furthermore, Ayed does not disclose a motion sensor in the vehicle or using the locator **12** to receive a signal from a motion sensor. Thus, the cited combination does not teach this feature of claim 53.

6. Claim 53 is also amended to recite “responsive to the locator panel receiving the disturbance signal, the locator panel notifies a security patrol.” As noted above, Tompkins does not teach a locator panel at all. Furthermore, in addition to the reasons given above, Ayed’s locator **12** does not meet the requirements of claim 53 because it is incapable of “notif[ying] a security patrol.” Ayed does not teach anything about a security patrol at all. Thus, the cited combination fails to teach this feature of the claim.

7. Finally, claim 53 also now requires “wherein responsive to the driver inserting the card into the locator panel, the locator panel displays the position of the vehicle and the light in the base illuminates to assist the driver in locating the vehicle.” As explained above, Tompkins fails to teach a locator panel at all, and Ayed’s locator **12** is incapable of having a card inserted into it. Furthermore, Ayed’s locator **12** cannot cause a light in a base in the vehicle to become illuminated. Such a feature is simply not contemplated by Ayed at all. This is a significant advantage of claim 53 over Ayed because it provides the user with a visual cue emitted from the vehicle itself. Thus, the user is not forced to rely solely on a map, but can look for the vehicle in the parking facility with an illuminated light. Thus, the cited combination fails to teach this feature of the claim.

Because the Tompkins/Ayed combination fails to teach at least the features of claim 53 recited above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Rudolf O. Siegesmund

Registration No. 37,720

Gordon & Rees LLP

Suite 2800

2100 Ross Avenue

Dallas, Texas 75201

214-231-4660

214-461-4053 (fax)

rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com